

Fate of charmed mesons near chiral symmetry restoration in hot matter

Chihiro Sasaki^{1,2}

¹Frankfurt Institute for Advanced Studies, D-60438 Frankfurt am Main, Germany

²Institute of Theoretical Physics, University of Wrocław, PL-50204 Wrocław, Poland

(Dated: November 10, 2014)

Chiral thermodynamics of charmed mesons is formulated at finite temperature within a $2+1+1$ -flavored effective Lagrangian incorporating heavy quark symmetry. The charmed-meson mean fields act as an extra source which breaks the chiral symmetry explicitly. This leads to effective interactions between the light and heavy-light mesons, which intrinsically depend on temperature. Effective masses of the scalar and pseudoscalar charmed-mesons tend to approach each other as increasing temperature, so that the splitting between the chiral partners is reduced. These chiral splittings are shown to be less sensitive to the light-quark flavors, attributed to the underlying heavy quark symmetry. Consequently, chiral symmetry restoration is more manifest for the strange charmed-mesons than for the strange light mesons. The effective masses are also compared with the results in the one-loop chiral perturbation theory. A substantial difference is found at a relatively low temperature, $T \sim f_\pi$.

PACS numbers: 14.40.Lb, 12.39.Fe, 12.39.Hg

1. INTRODUCTION

Heavy flavors, charm and beauty, are produced at the initial stage of the high-energy heavy-ion collisions, so that they are expected to carry the dynamical history of a created matter, the Quark-Gluon Plasma (QGP) (see, e.g. [1] for a review). Recent experimental observations have revealed that charm quarks are thermalized [2–5], contrary to earlier anticipation. Charge fluctuations calculated in lattice QCD also indicate that the charmed mesons are deconfined together with light-flavor mesons [6]. Given those observations, comprehensive exploration for the chiral aspects of the heavy-light hadrons increases its importance. Their characteristics in a hot system are important input to disentangle the transport properties of hadronic matter and QGP.

In-medium modifications of the charmed mesons have been extensively studied by using QCD sum rules [7–9] and effective theories [10–16]. In constructing effective Lagrangians for the heavy-light mesons, besides spontaneous chiral symmetry breaking, heavy quark symmetry is a vital ingredient [17]. The pseudo-scalar D and vector D^* states fill in the same multiplet H , forming the lowest spin partners. Their low-energy dynamics is dominated by interactions with Nambu-Goldstone (NG) bosons, pions [18–21]. Introducing the multiplet including D and D^* inevitably accompanies another multiplet G which contains a scalar D_0^* and axial-vector D_1 states. Those parity partners, H and G , become degenerate when the chiral symmetry is restored [22, 23]. However, it is not a priori obvious how the chiral mass splitting, which is ~ 350 MeV in matter-free space, is resolved: one increases and another decreases in their masses, or the two of them decrease/increase. This crucially affects e.g. the dissociation of the charmed mesons in matter.

Aside from the chiral $SU(4)$ approach where the charm sector suffers from a huge explicit breaking of the extended flavor symmetry, a self-consistent study for the

thermal charmed-mesons with implementing heavy quark symmetry has received little attention. In the present paper, we formulate a chiral effective theory for the light and heavy-light mesons in a hot/dense medium under the mean field approximation. A special attention is devoted to the in-medium masses of the chiral partners. We discuss the role of the heavy quark symmetry in the thermal evolution of the chiral mass splittings for the non-strange and strange states. The result is also compared with the one-loop self-energy calculated in chiral effective field theory.

2. EFFECTIVE LAGRANGIAN

To describe the light-quark sector, we take the standard linear sigma model Lagrangian with three flavors:

$$\mathcal{L}_L = \bar{q}(i\cancel{\partial} - gT^a(\sigma^a + i\gamma_5\pi^a))q + \text{tr}[\partial_\mu\Sigma^\dagger \cdot \partial^\mu\Sigma] - V_L(\Sigma), \quad (2.1)$$

where the potential, including $U(1)_A$ breaking effects, is

$$V_L = m^2\text{tr}[\Sigma^\dagger\Sigma] + \lambda_1(\text{tr}[\Sigma^\dagger\Sigma])^2 + \lambda_2\text{tr}[(\Sigma^\dagger\Sigma)^2] - c(\det\Sigma + \det\Sigma^\dagger) - \text{tr}[h(\Sigma + \Sigma^\dagger)], \quad (2.2)$$

with the chiral field $\Sigma = T^a\Sigma^a = T^a(\sigma^a + i\pi^a)$ as a 3×3 complex matrix in terms of the scalar σ^a and the pseudoscalar π^a states. The last term with $h = T^ah^a$ breaks the chiral symmetry explicitly.

Heavy-light meson fields with negative and positive

parity are introduced as [22, 23] ^{#1}

$$H = \frac{1+\not{P}}{2} [P_\mu^* \gamma^\mu + iP\gamma_5] , \quad (2.3)$$

$$G = \frac{1+\not{P}}{2} [-iD_\mu^* \gamma^\mu \gamma_5 + D] , \quad (2.4)$$

and chiral eigenstates are given from those parity eigenstates via

$$\mathcal{H}_{L,R} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (G \pm iH\gamma_5) . \quad (2.5)$$

The field operators are transformed under the chiral and heavy quark symmetries as

$$\mathcal{H}_{L,R} \rightarrow S\mathcal{H}_{L,R}g_{L,R}^\dagger , \quad (2.6)$$

$$\Sigma \rightarrow g_L \Sigma g_R^\dagger , \quad (2.7)$$

with the group elements $g_{L,R} \in SU(3)_{L,R}$ and $S \in SU(2)_{Q=c}$.

The lowest-order Lagrangian to first order in Σ and to zeroth order in $1/m_Q$ up to two heavy-light fields is [22, 23]

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{HL}}^{\text{kin}} = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} [\bar{\mathcal{H}}_L i\nu \cdot \partial \mathcal{H}_L + \bar{\mathcal{H}}_R i\nu \cdot \partial \mathcal{H}_R] , \quad (2.8)$$

$$\begin{aligned} V_{\text{HL}}^{(2)} &= \frac{m_0}{2} \text{Tr} [\bar{\mathcal{H}}_L \mathcal{H}_L + \bar{\mathcal{H}}_R \mathcal{H}_R] \\ &+ \frac{g_\pi}{4} \text{Tr} [\Sigma^\dagger \bar{\mathcal{H}}_L \mathcal{H}_R + \Sigma \bar{\mathcal{H}}_R \mathcal{H}_L] \\ &- i \frac{g_A}{2F_\pi} \text{Tr} [\gamma_5 \not{\partial} \Sigma^\dagger \cdot \bar{\mathcal{H}}_L \mathcal{H}_R - \gamma_5 \not{\partial} \Sigma \cdot \bar{\mathcal{H}}_R \mathcal{H}_L] , \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

where traces are taken over Dirac and light-flavor indices.

A self-consistent calculation for the $\mathcal{H}_{L,R}$ requires a further contribution beyond $V_{\text{HL}}^{(2)}$. Minimal extension for this is to add terms including four heavy-light fields. Following the given transformation properties, one finds in the same order

$$\begin{aligned} V_{\text{HL}}^{(4,0)} &= c_1 \text{Tr} [\bar{\mathcal{H}}_L \mathcal{H}_L \bar{\mathcal{H}}_L \mathcal{H}_L + \bar{\mathcal{H}}_R \mathcal{H}_R \bar{\mathcal{H}}_R \mathcal{H}_R] \\ &+ c_2 \left((\text{Tr} [\bar{\mathcal{H}}_L \mathcal{H}_L])^2 + (\text{Tr} [\bar{\mathcal{H}}_R \mathcal{H}_R])^2 \right) \\ &+ c_3 \text{Tr} [\bar{\mathcal{H}}_L \mathcal{H}_R \bar{\mathcal{H}}_R \mathcal{H}_L] \\ &+ c_4 \text{Tr} [\bar{\mathcal{H}}_L \mathcal{H}_L] [\bar{\mathcal{H}}_R \mathcal{H}_R] , \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

$$\begin{aligned} V_{\text{HL}}^{(4,1)} &= \kappa_1 \text{Tr} [\Sigma^\dagger \bar{\mathcal{H}}_L \mathcal{H}_R \bar{\mathcal{H}}_R \mathcal{H}_L + \Sigma \bar{\mathcal{H}}_R \mathcal{H}_L \bar{\mathcal{H}}_L \mathcal{H}_R] \\ &+ \kappa_2 \text{Tr} [\Sigma^\dagger \bar{\mathcal{H}}_L \mathcal{H}_L \bar{\mathcal{H}}_L \mathcal{H}_R + \Sigma \bar{\mathcal{H}}_R \mathcal{H}_R \bar{\mathcal{H}}_R \mathcal{H}_L] \\ &+ \kappa_3 (\text{Tr} [\Sigma^\dagger \bar{\mathcal{H}}_L \mathcal{H}_R] \text{Tr} [\bar{\mathcal{H}}_R \mathcal{H}_L] \\ &\quad + \text{Tr} [\Sigma \bar{\mathcal{H}}_R \mathcal{H}_L] \text{Tr} [\bar{\mathcal{H}}_L \mathcal{H}_R]) \\ &+ \kappa_4 (\text{Tr} [\Sigma^\dagger \bar{\mathcal{H}}_L \mathcal{H}_R] \text{Tr} [\bar{\mathcal{H}}_L \mathcal{H}_L] \\ &\quad + \text{Tr} [\Sigma \bar{\mathcal{H}}_R \mathcal{H}_L] \text{Tr} [\bar{\mathcal{H}}_R \mathcal{H}_R]) . \end{aligned} \quad (2.11)$$

Explicit $SU(3)$ symmetry breaking is encoded in the potential with the following replacement,

$$\Sigma \rightarrow \lambda h \Sigma , \quad (2.12)$$

with λ denoting a set of constant parameters. The entire potential is thus

$$V_{\text{HL}} = V_{\text{HL}}^{(2)} + V_{\text{HL}}^{(4,0)} + V_{\text{HL}}^{(4,1)} + V_{\text{HL}}^{\text{exp}} . \quad (2.13)$$

For our thermodynamic calculations, we employ the mean field approximation. The $SU(2)$ isospin violation is also neglected, which leads to σ_0 and σ_8 as non-vanishing condensates. Those fields contain both non-strange and strange components. Thus, it is convenient to transpose them into pure non-strange and strange parts, via

$$\begin{pmatrix} \sigma_q \\ \sigma_s \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{2} & 1 \\ 1 & -\sqrt{2} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_0 \\ \sigma_8 \end{pmatrix} . \quad (2.14)$$

The effective quark masses in this base are

$$M_q = \frac{g}{2} \sigma_q , \quad M_s = \frac{g}{\sqrt{2}} \sigma_s . \quad (2.15)$$

The partially conserved axial current (PCAC) hypothesis relates $\sigma_{q,s}$ with the weak decay constants for pions and kaons:

$$\langle \sigma_q \rangle = f_\pi , \quad \langle \sigma_s \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (2f_K - f_\pi) . \quad (2.16)$$

The scalar charmed-mesons are accommodated in the multiplets,

$$D = (D_q, D_q, D_s) , \quad (2.17)$$

where due to the isospin symmetry $D_u = D_d = D_q$. In-medium masses are calculated from the potential via

$$\Delta M_{D_i} = M_{D_i} - m_c = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2 V_{\text{HL}}}{\partial D_i^2} , \quad (2.18)$$

with $i = u, d, s$ and the charm quark mass m_c . From Eq. (2.13), one finds

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta M_{D(0^+)} &= m_0 + \frac{1}{4} g_\pi^q \sigma_q + 2k_0 (4D_q^2 + D_s^2) \\ &\quad + 6k_q \sigma_q D_q^2 , \end{aligned} \quad (2.19)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta M_{D_s(0^+)} &= m_0 + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} g_\pi^s \sigma_s + 2k_0 (2D_q^2 + 3D_s^2) \\ &\quad + 6\sqrt{2} k_s \sigma_s D_s^2 , \end{aligned} \quad (2.20)$$

$$\Delta M_{D(0^-)} = m_0 - \frac{1}{4} g_\pi^q \sigma_q + 2k_0 (4D_q^2 + D_s^2) , \quad (2.21)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta M_{D_s(0^-)} &= m_0 - \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} g_\pi^s \sigma_s + 2k_0 (2D_q^2 + 3D_s^2) , \end{aligned} \quad (2.22)$$

^{#1} We will use the notations D for a scalar and P for a pseudo-scalar state, unless otherwise stated with quantum numbers.

where $k_0, g_\pi^q, g_\pi^s, k_q, k_s$ are functions of the parameters c 's, κ 's and λ 's.

In the mean field approximation, thermodynamics of this system is described by the following potential:

$$\Omega = \Omega_q + V_L + V_{HL}, \quad (2.23)$$

$$\Omega_q = 6T \sum_{f=u,d,s} \int \frac{d^3p}{(2\pi)^3} [\ln(1 - n_f) + \ln(1 - \bar{n}_f)], \quad (2.24)$$

with the Fermi-Dirac distribution functions $n_f, \bar{n}_f = 1/(1 + e^{(E_f \mp \mu_f)/T})$ and the quasi-quark energies $E_f = \sqrt{p^2 + M_f^2}$. By minimizing the thermodynamic potential, the four mesonic mean-fields are determined self-consistently at a given T and μ_f via

$$\frac{\partial \Omega}{\partial \sigma_q} = \frac{\partial \Omega}{\partial \sigma_s} = \frac{\partial \Omega}{\partial D_q} = \frac{\partial \Omega}{\partial D_s} = 0. \quad (2.25)$$

In the thermal model applied in heavy-ion collisions, temperature T and baryon chemical potential μ_B are independent parameters. On the other hand, the strange and charm chemical potentials are fixed via strange and charm number conservation [24]. The chemical potential for a particle i is introduced as

$$\mu_i = \mu_B B_i + \mu_s S_i + \mu_c C_i, \quad (2.26)$$

with the baryon number B_i , strangeness S_i and charm C_i quantum numbers. In term of the particle number density,

$$n_i = \frac{g_i}{2\pi^2} \int_0^\infty dp \frac{p^2}{e^{(E-\mu_i)/T} \pm 1}, \quad (2.27)$$

with the degeneracy factor g_i , the conservation conditions are given as

$$V \sum_i n_i S_i = 0, \quad V \sum_i n_i C_i = 0, \quad (2.28)$$

where V denotes the volume of a system. In the following, we will take $\mu_B = 0$, so that the strange and charm conservation are fulfilled trivially, $\mu_s = \mu_c = 0$.

3. CHIRAL THERMODYNAMICS IN THE MEAN-FIELD APPROXIMATION

Conventionally model parameters are fixed at zero temperature so as to reproduce the meson masses and decay constants. However, regarding effective models as an approximation of QCD in low energy, the parameters in the effective Lagrangian vary with temperature. Such intrinsic thermal effects are carried by the higher-lying hadrons, and formally introduced via functional integration in deriving Green's functions. At finite temperature, a reliable way to extract those effective parameters is to match them with the observables in lattice QCD.




FIG. 1: Thermal expectation values of the mean fields, σ_q and σ_s . The pseudo-critical temperature fixed from the chiral susceptibility is $T_{pc} = 154$ MeV.

In the light-flavor sector, the sigma meson mass m_σ is often treated as an adjustable parameter. In the vacuum the nature of the lowest-lying scalar state remains not fully understood yet due to a strong mixing to other states with the same quantum number, e.g. a tetra-quark state [25]. Thus, we use m_σ as a parameter to adjust the pseudo-critical temperature of chiral symmetry restoration to the lattice result, $T_{pc} = 154$ MeV extracted from the chiral susceptibility $\partial \langle \bar{q}q \rangle / \partial m_q$ [26]. The resultant choice in the linear sigma model is $m_\sigma = 400$ MeV. We will use other parameters fixed in the vacuum [27], summarized in Table I.

The parameters in the heavy-light sector at zero temperature are determined as in Table II where the following input was used; $m_c = 1.27$ GeV, $M_D(0^-) = 1.868$ GeV, $M_{D_s}(0^-) = 1.969$ GeV, $M_{D_s}(0^+) = 2.318$ GeV, and the pion and kaon decay constants $f_\pi = 92.4$ MeV, $f_K = 113$ MeV [25]. The current experimental value for the $D(0^+)$ mass by the Particle Data Group has a rather large error, $M_D^{\text{PDG}}(0^+) = 2318 \pm 29$ MeV. With the given parameters, the model predicts $M_D(0^+)/M_D^{\text{PDG}}(0^+) = 0.96$. The coupling constant g_π^q is extracted also from the decay mode, $D(0^+) \rightarrow D(0^-)\pi$, yielding $g_\pi^{\text{PDG}} = 3.6 = 0.95 \times g_\pi^q$.

In Fig. 1 we show thermal expectation values of the σ_q and σ_s in the mean field approximation. One readily sees that the chiral crossover is extremely broad; at T_{pc} the order parameter σ_q reaches $\sim 0.73 \times \sigma_q(T=0)$, whereas in lattice QCD the bilinear quark condensate drops more rapidly to almost a half of its vacuum value [26]. Also, the σ_s is accompanied to a large extent by the non-strange condensate σ_q , which is again inconsistent with the lattice observation.

This is traced back to a rather strong mixing between the light and heavy-light mean fields. The charmed-meson mean fields act as an extra source which breaks the chiral symmetry explicitly. The effective symmetry

c [GeV]	m [GeV]	λ_1	λ_2	h_q [GeV ³]	h_s [GeV ³]	g
4.81	0.495	-5.90	46.48	(0.121) ³	(0.336) ³	6.5

TABLE I: Set of parameters in the light sector with $m_\sigma = 400$ MeV [27].

m_0 [GeV]	g_π^q	g_π^s	k_0 [1/GeV ²]	k_q [1/GeV ³]	k_s [1/GeV ³]
1.04	3.78	2.61	-(1/0.74) ²	-(1/0.44) ³	-(1/0.53) ³

TABLE II: Set of parameters in the heavy-light sector.

breaking is induced by


$$h_q^* = h_q - D_q^2 \left(\frac{1}{2} g_\pi^q + 2k_q D_q^2 \right), \quad (3.1)$$

$$h_s^* = h_s - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} D_s^2 \left(\frac{1}{2} g_\pi^s + 2k_s D_s^2 \right). \quad (3.2)$$

At finite temperature, the size of $h_{q,s}^*$ varies via coupled equations of motion. As clearly indicated in Fig. 1, this results in the light-flavor $SU(2+1)$ symmetry promoted to approximate $SU(3)$ toward the chiral crossover, i.e. $h_q^* \simeq h_s^*$.

Since the charm quark mass is much larger than characteristic temperatures associated with the chiral crossover, such a strong modification of the $\sigma_{q,s}$ by the charmed mesons is unrealistic. In fact, there is no evidence found in lattice QCD that the $N_f = 2+1$ thermodynamics is affected by the dynamical charm quark around the chiral crossover [28]. The difference starts to appear above $T \sim 300$ MeV where the charmed mesons are supposed to be resolved already [6]. The present mean-field framework deals with the charmed mesons as static background fields which mix with the light scalar mean fields. This transmutes a light-flavor insensitivity to the condensates $\sigma_{q,s}$, which is an artifact of the current setup. Therefore, the sigma mean fields need to be adjusted by reducing the coupling constant(s) effectively, in such a way that the chiral properties are fit to the lattice observation.

In the light-flavor sector, a hierarchy lying among up, down and strange flavors is spoiled since the heavy quark symmetry over-influences the light-flavored quark condensates. Therefore, the correct tendency needs to be restored by controlling the effective interaction between the light and heavy-light mesons. Practically, we need to constrain the size of h_q^*/h_s^* within a certain range. To this end, we dictate in-medium changes to the parameters in the Lagrangian with the use of a reliable set of $\sigma_{q,s}(T)$. Possible profiles for the sigma fields are as given in Fig. 2, which are consistent with the quark condensates calculated in the $N_f = 2+1$ lattice QCD [26]. In order to control a relative size of σ_q to σ_s , we will introduce thermal modifications into the parameters in the strange sector, g_π^s and k_s , whereas the non-strange parameters

FIG. 2: Assumed profiles of thermal expectation values of σ_q and σ_s with $T_{pc} = 154$ MeV.

are kept to be the values fixed at $T = 0$ #2. The effective couplings $g_\pi^s(T)$ and $k_s(T)$ are determined by solving the gap equations (2.25) with the given profiles for the $\sigma_{q,s}$. In Fig. 3, one finds that those interactions decrease their strengths as the system approaches the chiral symmetry restoration, so that the overall symmetry breaking h_s^* is not reduced significantly. This is shown in Fig. 4.

The charmed-meson masses (2.22) are now calculated consistently to the lattice result in the light-flavor sector, as summarized in Fig. 5. The parity partners approach each other as temperature is increased both in the non-strange and strange sector, in consistent with the chiral restoration. The two pseudo-scalar states have the same trend that their masses are increasing with temperature, although the non-strange meson mass exhibits a rather weak modification. On the other hand, the two scalar states drop significantly; the non-strange meson mass by ~ 200 MeV and the strange meson mass by ~ 100 MeV. The mass splittings between the non-strange and strange states are around 200 MeV above T_{pc} due to the fact that

#2 Alternatively, one can use g_π^s and k_s being their vacuum values and introduce $g_\pi^q(T)$ and $k_q(T)$. This does not alter our main conclusion.




FIG. 3: Effective interactions among light and heavy-light mesons.




FIG. 4: Induced symmetry breaking with the effective couplings $g_\pi^s(T)$ and $k_s(T)$ (solid) and that with the constant interactions (dashed).

the chiral symmetry in the strange sector is not restored yet. Nevertheless, the chiral mass splittings between the scalar and pseudo-scalar states are almost of the same size,

$$\delta M_D(T_{pc}) \sim \delta M_{D_s}(T_{pc}) \sim 200 \text{ MeV}, \quad (3.3)$$

i.e. *the chiral mass differences in the heavy-light sector are blind to the light flavors*. This is a striking difference from the chiral properties of the light mesons, and is attributed to the heavy quark symmetry possessed by the leading-order Lagrangian in $1/m_Q$ expansion. In contrast, the chiral SU(4) model, where the charmed mesons are treated on the equal footing to the non-strange and strange mesons, yields a qualitatively different result from Eq. (3.3); δM_D is much smaller than δM_{D_s} , similar to the light meson masses [10].

The effective coupling $g_\pi^s(T)$ also affects the hadronic decays involving the D_s states. Those decay modes violate the isospin symmetry and thus they are suppressed.

This is followed dominantly via the π^0 - η mixing [29]. The decay width of $D_s(0^+) \rightarrow D_s(0^-) + \pi^0$ is

$$\Gamma \simeq \frac{(g_\pi^s)^2}{4\pi} \bar{p}_\pi \delta_{\pi^0\eta}^2, \quad (3.4)$$

where $\bar{p}_\pi = |\vec{p}_\pi|$ is the three-momentum of the pion in the rest frame of the decaying particle, and the π^0 - η mixing is given by

$$\delta_{\pi^0\eta} = \frac{2m_\pi^2(m_u - m_d)}{(m_\eta^2 - m_\pi^2)(m_u + m_d)}. \quad (3.5)$$

We recall that the g_π^s decreases with increasing temperature as given in Fig. 3, i.e. the D_s meson tends to be decoupled from the light-flavor sector. On top of the small isospin breaking, this decay mode becomes more suppressed in approaching T_{pc} , due to the $g_\pi^s(T)$ which controls the onset of chiral symmetry restoration. The decay process, $D_s(1^+) \rightarrow D_s(1^-) + \pi^0$, is quenched as well.

4. RESULTS IN CHIRAL PERTURBATION THEORY

At zero temperature, the composition of the lowest scalar meson is nontrivial because of a strong mixing between the conventional quarkonium and tetra-quark states. The scalar state around 1 GeV is a good candidate of the lowest $\bar{q}q$ -dominated meson. Thus, as long as a characteristic temperature is lower than the chiral crossover, the sigma meson in the linear sigma model can be integrated out since it lies well above the pion mass scale. The resultant Lagrangian contains only the NG bosons and the chiral symmetry is non-linearly realized. The basic building block is the 1-form $\alpha_\perp$,

$$\alpha_\perp^\mu = \frac{1}{2i} (\partial^\mu \xi \cdot \xi^\dagger - \partial^\mu \xi^\dagger \cdot \xi), \quad (4.1)$$




FIG. 5: In-medium masses of the non-strange (left) and strange (right) charmed-mesons with positive and negative parity.

where the NG bosons π are embedded in ξ as $\xi = e^{i\pi/f_\pi}$. The interaction to the heavy-light meson fields (2.4) is quantified by the following Lagrangian [30]:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\text{int}} = & k \left(\text{Tr} [H \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 \alpha_\perp^\mu \bar{H}] + \text{Tr} [G \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 \alpha_\perp^\mu \bar{G}] \right. \\ & \left. - i \text{Tr} [G \alpha_\perp \gamma^\mu \gamma_5 \bar{H}] + i \text{Tr} [H \alpha_\perp \gamma^\mu \gamma_5 \bar{G}] \right), \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

with the coupling constant $k = 0.59$ extracted from the decay $D^* \rightarrow D\pi$. At finite temperature, thermal corrections to the charmed-meson masses are induced from the self-energy. The major temperature dependence is carried by the NG bosons. Therefore, we approximate the in-medium propagator of the D mesons to their vacuum forms. The pion propagator is replaced as

$$\frac{1}{p^2 - m_\pi^2 + i\epsilon} \rightarrow \frac{1}{p^2 - m_\pi^2 + i\epsilon} - \frac{2\pi i}{e^{|p_0|/T} - 1} \delta(p^2 - m_\pi^2). \quad (4.3)$$

Substituting those propagators to the self-energy at one loop [30], one obtains the following thermal corrections to the scalar (Π_S^*) and the pseudo-scalar (Π_P^*) states:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_S^* = & C_2(N_f) \frac{k^2}{f_\pi^2} \left[\int \frac{d^3p}{(2\pi)^3} n_\pi(m_\pi, T) \right. \\ & - \left(M_P + M_S + \frac{m_\pi^2}{M_S} \right) A_0^*(m_\pi, T) \\ & \left. - \frac{M_S^2 - m_\pi^2}{M_P} A_S^*(m_\pi, T) - M_P A_P^*(m_\pi, T) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_P^* = & C_2(N_f) \frac{k^2}{f_\pi^2} \left[\int \frac{d^3p}{(2\pi)^3} n_\pi(m_\pi, T) \right. \\ & - \left(M_P + M_S + \frac{m_\pi^2}{M_P} \right) A_0^*(m_\pi, T) \\ & \left. - \frac{M_P^2 - m_\pi^2}{M_P} A_P^*(m_\pi, T) - M_S A_S^*(m_\pi, T) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

where $M_{S,P}$ represents the scalar (pseudo-scalar) charmed meson mass, and the functions A_0^* and $A_{S,P}^*$

are introduced in terms of the Bose-Einstein distribution function n_π as

$$n_\pi = \frac{1}{e^{\omega/T} - 1}, \quad \omega = \sqrt{p^2 + m_\pi^2}, \quad (4.6)$$

$$A_0^* = \int \frac{d^3p}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{n_\pi(\omega)}{\omega}, \quad (4.7)$$

$$A_{S,P}^* = \int \frac{d^3p}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{n_\pi(\omega)}{\omega + M_{S,P}}. \quad (4.8)$$

The group factor $C_2(N_f)$ is defined as $(T^a)_{ij}(T^a)_{jl} = C_2(N_f)\delta_{il}$. The chiral mass difference is thus

$$\begin{aligned} \delta M = & C_2(N_f) \frac{k^2}{f_\pi^2} m_\pi^2 \left[\left(\frac{1}{M_P} - \frac{1}{M_S} \right) A_0^*(m_\pi) \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{1}{M_S} A_S^*(m_\pi) - \frac{1}{M_P} A_P^*(m_\pi) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

which is less sensitive to a temperature rise. If the mass parameters $M_{S,P}$ carry a certain temperature dependence so that M_S approaches M_P as temperature is increased, the chiral partners tend to be degenerate. Such non-trivial intrinsic thermal effects must show up beyond the standard one-loop perturbative method.

In Fig. 6, the results are compared with the effective masses of the non-strange charmed mesons discussed in the previous section. The pion loop yields a monotonic decrease with temperature for the scalar and pseudo-scalar states. A difference from the mean-field theory starts to appear at rather low temperature, $T \sim f_\pi \sim 0.67m_\pi$. This temperature cannot be fixed solely by the symmetries, but relies on the dynamics of the theories, in particular the onset of chiral criticality. This is absent in the standard chiral perturbation theory, whereas present in the mean-field theory considered in the previous section via a self-consistent prescription. The agreement with the self-consistent result will be expected at a higher temperature when higher loops and/or more resonances are included.




FIG. 6: Comparison of the non-strange charmed-meson masses in the present mean-field model (solid) with the corresponding results in the one-loop chiral perturbation theory (dashed).

5. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we have formulated a chiral mean-field theory for the light and heavy-light mesons at finite temperature based on the heavy quark symmetry. In order to avoid an unrealistically strong mixing between the light-flavor and the charmed meson sector, effective interactions depending on temperature are introduced, which can be extracted from the chiral condensates calculated in lattice QCD. The coupling of the strange charmed meson to the sigma meson, g_π^s , becomes quenched as temperature is increased toward the chiral pseudo-critical point T_{pc} . Our main result is that the chiral mass splittings are essentially insensitive to the light-quark flavors, in spite of a non-negligible explicit breaking of the chiral $SU(3)$ symmetry. This “blindness” of the charm quark to the light degrees of freedom is dictated by the heavy quark symmetry. In contrast, the kaon and its chiral partner masses become degenerate at a higher temperature than T_{pc} , indicating a delay of the $SU(3)$ symmetry restoration. In the heavy-light sector, on the other hand, the strange charmed meson captures the onset of chiral symmetry restoration more strongly than the strange light meson does. The quenched g_π^s leads also to a strong sup-

pression of the scalar D_s decay toward T_{pc} , on top of the suppression due to the small isospin violation. The same should be carried over to the B and B_s mesons with which the heavy quark symmetry is more reliable.

Although the present model does not enable to handle a confinement/deconfinement transition, it reliably captures the chiral aspects of the charmed mesons constrained by the heavy flavor symmetry. Given the lattice QCD observations that non-strange and strange hadrons seem to be resolved to their constituents around the chiral crossover, the system contains low-lying mesons and the chiral fermions (quarks) when the baryon chemical potential is sufficiently small. The main result shown in this work will be robust in hadronic phase up to the chiral restoration point as long as there is no strong first-order transition.

Those medium modifications may yield some consequences on the nuclear modification factor and the elliptic flow in high-energy heavy-ion collisions, on top of the effects discussed in [31] where the scalar D and D_s states are chirally unmodified. Scenarios of charmonium suppression [32] will certainly be affected by the modified heavy-light mesons around the chiral symmetry restoration. In particular, the dissociation of the charmed mesons needs to be reexamined.

Application of our approach to a dense system requires further implementation of (i) strange and charm number conservation, and (ii) reliable constraint(s) on the effective interaction between the light and heavy-light mesons. At zero density, the latter has been provided by the lattice chiral condensates. Alternatively, a more microscopic framework will enable us to derive the in-medium coupling as a function of temperature and density. This becomes an essential input especially for the study of various charge fluctuations [33].

Acknowledgments

We acknowledge stimulating discussions with K. Redlich. This work has been partly supported by the Hessian LOEWE initiative through the Helmholtz International Center for FAIR (HIC for FAIR), and by the Polish Science Foundation (NCN) under Maestro grant 2013/10/A/ST2/00106.

-
- [1] R. Rapp and H. van Hees, R. C. Hwa, X.-N. Wang (Ed.) Quark Gluon Plasma 4, World Scientific, 111 (2010).
 - [2] A. Adare *et al.* [PHENIX Collaboration], Phys. Rev. C **84**, 044905 (2011).
 - [3] L. Adamczyk *et al.* [STAR Collaboration], arXiv:1404.6185 [nucl-ex].
 - [4] B. Abelev *et al.* [ALICE Collaboration], JHEP **1209**, 112 (2012).
 - [5] B. Abelev *et al.* [ALICE Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 102301 (2013).
 - [6] A. Bazavov, H.-T. Ding, P. Hegde, O. Kaczmarek, F. Karsch, E. Laermann, Y. Maezawa and S. Mukherjee *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **737**, 210 (2014).
 - [7] A. Hayashigaki, Phys. Lett. B **487**, 96 (2000).
 - [8] T. Hilger, R. Thomas and B. Kampfer, Phys. Rev. C **79**, 025202 (2009).
 - [9] Z. G. Wang and T. Huang, Phys. Rev. C **84**, 048201 (2011).
 - [10] D. Roder, J. Ruppert and D. H. Rischke, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 016003 (2003).

- [11] A. Mishra, E. L. Bratkovskaya, J. Schaffner-Bielich, S. Schramm and H. Stoecker, Phys. Rev. C **69**, 015202 (2004).
- [12] M. F. M. Lutz and C. L. Korpa, Phys. Lett. B **633**, 43 (2006).
- [13] L. Tolos, A. Ramos and T. Mizutani, Phys. Rev. C **77**, 015207 (2008).
- [14] D. Blaschke, P. Costa and Y. L. Kalinovsky, Phys. Rev. D **85**, 034005 (2012).
- [15] R. Molina, D. Gamermann, E. Oset and L. Tolos, Eur. Phys. J. A **42**, 31 (2009).
- [16] S. Yasui and K. Sudoh, Phys. Rev. C **87**, 015202 (2013).
- [17] N. Isgur and M. B. Wise, Phys. Lett. B **232**, 113 (1989); Phys. Lett. B **237**, 527 (1990).
- [18] H. Georgi, Phys. Lett. B **240**, 447 (1990).
- [19] M. B. Wise, Phys. Rev. D **45**, 2188 (1992).
- [20] G. Burdman and J. F. Donoghue, Phys. Lett. B **280**, 287 (1992).
- [21] T. M. Yan, H. Y. Cheng, C. Y. Cheung, G. L. Lin, Y. C. Lin and H. L. Yu, Phys. Rev. D **46**, 1148 (1992) [Erratum-ibid. D **55**, 5851 (1997)].
- [22] M. A. Nowak, M. Rho and I. Zahed, Phys. Rev. D **48**, 4370 (1993).
- [23] W. A. Bardeen and C. T. Hill, Phys. Rev. D **49**, 409 (1994).
- [24] P. Braun-Munzinger and J. Stachel, Phys. Lett. B **490**, 196 (2000).
- [25] J. Beringer *et al.* [Particle Data Group Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **86**, 010001 (2012).
- [26] A. Bazavov, T. Bhattacharya, M. Cheng, C. DeTar, H. T. Ding, S. Gottlieb, R. Gupta and P. Hegde *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **85**, 054503 (2012).
- [27] B. J. Schaefer and M. Wagner, Phys. Rev. D **79**, 014018 (2009).
- [28] S. Borsanyi, G. Endrodi, Z. Fodor, S. D. Katz, S. Krieg, C. Ratti, C. Schroeder and K. K. Szabo, PoS LATTICE **2011**, 201 (2011).
- [29] W. A. Bardeen, E. J. Eichten and C. T. Hill, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 054024 (2003).
- [30] M. Harada, M. Rho and C. Sasaki, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 074002 (2004).
- [31] M. He, R. J. Fries and R. Rapp, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, no. 11, 112301 (2013).
- [32] R. Rapp, D. Blaschke and P. Crochet, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **65**, 209 (2010).
- [33] C. Sasaki and K. Redlich, in progress.